



REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given to the present application. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1-8 have been amended and Claims 13-20 have been added to the present application. The basis for the amendments and new claims may be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw his rejections in view of the above amendments and remarks as set forth below.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,353,121 (Young). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Young reference generally discloses an interactive television schedule system that allows a television viewer to access an on-screen television program listing and to use the program listing to facilitate control operations of a video recording device. However, as noted by the Examiner, Young does not teach or suggest an interface which allows a user to interact with the system using complex, natural language spoken requests.

In contrast, Applicant's invention provides an interactive replay system for accessing recorded items of program content. The interactive replay system employs a file write mechanism to store electronic program guide information for each recorded item of program content. The interactive replay system, as recited

in amended Claim 1, further includes "a speech recognizer that receives a spoken request for a specific recorded item of program content and generates an input sentence corresponding to the spoken request, where the spoken request includes electronic program guide information associated with the specific recorded item of program content" as well as "a natural language parser that receives the input sentence from the speech recognizer and identifies the at least one electronic program guide attribute from the input sentence" in combination with the other elements recited in the claim. In this way, recorded items of program content can be accessed by a user using spoken natural language requests which include electronic program guide information. The Young reference does not teach or suggest an interface which allows a user to interact with the system using complex, natural language spoken requests. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1, along with claims depending therefrom, defines patentable subject matter over Young.

In relation to Claim 2, the Examiner relies on U.S. Patent No. 6,075,575 (Schein) to teach the use of "a voice recognition device so that the system could receive spoken commands from the viewer and converting the spoken commands into signals to facilitate use of television schedule information". It is envisioned that the Examiner may contend that the Applicant's invention as set forth in amended Claim 1 is not patentable in view of the Young reference in combination with the Schein reference.

In this regard, Applicant asserts that the Schein reference does not teach or suggest storing recorded items of program content in association with

corresponding electronic program guide information as recited in Claim 1. Moreover, a voice recognition device by itself does not constitute an interface which can process natural language spoken requests. Thus, Applicant asserts that the Schein reference does not teach or suggest an interface which allows a user to interact with an interactive replay system using complex, natural language spoken requests.

In sum, none of the reference cited by the Examiner teach or suggest an interactive replay system where recorded items of program content can be accessed by a user using spoken natural language requests as recited in Claim 1 of Applicant's invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1, along with claims depending therefrom, defines patentable subject matter.

Applicant notes that independent Claim 9 should be allowable, along with claims depending therefrom, for the same reasons as Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

Claims 2 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,075,575. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In response to this rejection, Applicant directs the Examiner to amended independent Claims 1 from which the rejected claims depend. As discussed above, Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the patentable and non-

obvious features of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds for rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and further requests that they be withdrawn. Accordingly, it is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1230.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 25, 2001

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303
(248) 641-1600

By: 

Timothy D. MacIntyre
Reg. No. 42,824
Attorneys for Applicant

TDM/mas